

Discussion of Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Protocol

June 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item opens a discussion on the development of a protocol or agreement between the Commission and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The two national accrediting bodies for educator preparation, NCATE and TEAC, are in the midst of unifying into CAEP. CAEP is requesting that states begin to develop the agreement that will govern the relationship between the state and CAEP.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

Currently California has agreements in place with both TEAC (Appendix B) and NCATE (Appendix C) that specify how joint/concurrent accreditation activities will take place. The current agreement with TEAC expires on January 31, 2012 and the NCATE protocol expires in December 2014. As one of the states that currently has agreements with both TEAC and NCATE, the CAEP leadership hopes that California would be willing to negotiate a CAEP agreement early in the transition window rather than waiting until both the current agreements expire.

CAEP accreditation will have four options for the unit accreditation process (Appendix A) and each institution would have the option to select any of the four unit options. In addition CAEP has identified three program review options. In the process of seeking unit accreditation, all programs at the institution must participate in program review. Each state may elect to allow its institutions to participate in one, two or all three program review options. Option 1 is when states retain control over program review and approval—this is what California currently does with its Biennial Reports and Program Assessment. Option 2a is the current SPA process where each approved program submits information to the appropriate specialized association and the association decides if the program is recognized or not. Option 2b is a new process developed specifically for CAEP and involves programs submitting candidate assessment data. The data from similar programs are reviewed by a cluster of individuals. The review will not approve or disapprove programs but instead will provide information that can be used by the institution, the state, the CAEP team.

Possible topics to address in the initial CAEP Protocol

It would be of help to staff if the COA would have a discussion of the types of information that it feels are important to be included in the initial CAEP protocol. Provided below are some of the major topics addressed in the current agreements to frame the COA's discussion:

1. Entities in the partnership—CAEP and CTC. Institutions of higher education or other sponsors? Agreements on communication among entities?
2. Process to request national accreditation in conjunction with California accreditation procedures

3. Type of Visit—Joint, Concurrent, or ?
4. Standards that apply to the unit and all its programs
 - Unit: CAEP, Commission’s Common Standards or a Crosswalk connecting the Commission’s Common Standards to the CAEP Standards
 - Programs: California Standards, Specialized Professional Association Standards (SPA) or other. Which of the three program review options will be acceptable in California?
5. Composition of the Team and Team Size
 - Role of Team Members
 - Role of the Chair or Co-Chairs
 - Observers, if applicable
 - State Consultants
6. Training for Team Members, Observers and State Consultants
7. Report
 - Format
 - Timelines
 - Process after the visit—factual corrections, rejoinder
8. 3rd Party Testimony
9. Exit Report
10. Appeal Procedure

Next Steps

As CAEP continues to move toward full implementation in 2013, both NCATE and TEAC have requested that states work with the state affiliate of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). Staff has contacted the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE), the California affiliate of AACTE, and provided information to the CCTE Board on the new CAEP accreditation process. Once the Board has had a chance to discuss the information, additional communication will take place. This may be in the form of an article for the CCTE Newsletter, information shared in the Policy Session at a conference, or a discussion with the Board or interested members.

Staff will continue to monitor the development of the CAEP process and update the COA as is appropriate. Additionally in a future agenda item, staff will present the three CAEP standards with an analysis of how these new standards align with the current NCATE/TEAC standards and processes as well as the Commission’s Common Standards.

Appendix A

Accreditation Options of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation			
All institutional members of CAEP must: (1) meet the eligibility requirements and continue to meet them in order to maintain membership, (2) ensure that accredited programs meet the CAEP standards, and (3) produce an annual report to CAEP. Institutions with established educator preparation programs can choose from the two options focused on research and the two options focused on improvement. Below are descriptions of how CAEP will define and implement the elements within each option.			
Pre-Accreditation Process A pre-accreditation process will be developed for accrediting new programs, such as the many alternative providers that do not have a track record and new teacher educator programs in colleges and universities.			
Commission A (currently NCATE)		Commission B (currently TEAC)	
<u>Guiding framework</u> Existing NCATE Standards and CAEP Standards		<u>Guiding framework</u> TEAC's Quality Principles and CAEP Standards	
<u>Organizational Unit(s)</u> Commission A accredits the professional education unit(s) ¹ that is responsible for educator preparation. For accreditation purposes, programs are organized by initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation, which includes graduate programs for advanced teaching and other school professionals.		<u>Organizational Unit(s)</u> Institutions seeking accreditation through Commission B options can organize their work as best suits the evidence they bring forward. Program ¹ options (e.g. licensure areas, endorsements, etc.) can be organized into one or more larger program units ¹ that share a common logic, structure, quality control system and similar and comparable categories of evidence. Educational leadership programs are generally presented through a separate self-study.	
Formative Process Units submit evidence that they have a well-developed conceptual framework and assessment system. These documents are reviewed by a committee of representatives from stakeholders who write a report approving the institution's readiness to host a site visit.		Formative Process Programs submit drafts of their self-study/studies which are reviewed by a staff evaluator and returned with comments. The formative evaluator and the lead auditor review a final draft of the self-study document to determine whether or not it is ready to be audited.	
Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative	Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement	Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief	Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report
<u>Self-Study Report</u> (1)The Unit submits an institutional report (IR) that describes how the unit has been involved in continuous improvement related to the standards since the previous visit. An Offsite BOE Team reviews the IR, annual reports, programs submitted for national or	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The unit submits an institutional report (IR) that provides an overview of the institution and conceptual framework, responds to three prompts for each standard, and indicates the steps it has taken to move to the target level on at least one standard.	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The program produces a monograph called an Inquiry Brief showing evidence that program completers have achieved the program's goals, including evidence of candidates' meeting the CAEP Standards. The program must also show evidence of faculty	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The program completes a comprehensive academic audit that encompasses its quality control system, and its evidence of candidates' meeting the CAEP Standards. Based on this investigation, the program prepares a Program Quality Audit Report.

¹ The terms "program" and "unit" have not yet been commonly defined by the Design Team. The development of a common glossary is one of the tasks to be addressed during the two-year transition to CAEP. The terms are being used here as the two organizations currently define them.

Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative	Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement	Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief	Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report
<p>equivalent state review, and exhibits of evidence to prepare a report indicating any concerns related to meeting the standards. If all evidence indicates that standards continue to be met, the institution will be declared eligible for the Transformation Initiative (TI) option.</p> <p>Prior to the visit, the unit submits an IR Addendum, which responds to the offsite report.</p> <p>(2)The unit submits its proposal for a TI. The Committee on Transformation Initiatives reviews the proposal and provides feedback on the plan and its implementation.</p>	<p>An institution seeking accreditation for the first time submits an IR to establish a baseline for meeting the elements of each standard.</p> <p>An Offsite BOE Team reviews the IR, annual reports, programs submitted for national or equivalent state review, and exhibits of evidence to prepare a report indicating any concerns related to meeting the standards.</p> <p>Prior to the visit, the unit submits an IR Addendum, which responds to the offsite report.</p>	<p>learning, of the existence of a functioning and influential quality control system and of capacity and commitment.</p> <p>The program completes an internal audit of its own quality control system.</p>	<p>The program must also show evidence of faculty learning and of institutional capacity for, and commitment to, program quality.</p> <p>The program develops a plan for future inquiry based on reliable and valid evidence of student learning.</p>
<u>Site Visit Team</u> The size of the team depends on the size and complexity of educator preparation at the institution, but is generally 3-5 members. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement. The team includes individuals who represent teacher education, the teaching profession and other CAEP stakeholder groups. The team for the TI option also includes an expert on the institution's TI.	<u>Site Visit Team</u> The size of the team depends on the size and complexity of educator preparation at the institution, but is generally 3-5 members. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement. The team includes individuals who represent teacher education, the teaching profession and other CAEP stakeholder groups.	<u>Site Visit Team</u> Site visits are led by a staff member (lead auditor) and include one or more peer-reviewers (consulting auditors) and a local practitioner identified by the program. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement.	<u>Site Visit Team</u> Site visits are led by a staff member (lead auditor) who has also provided formative evaluation. The team includes one or more peer-reviewers (consulting auditors) and a local practitioner identified by the program. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement.
<u>Site Visit Format</u> The Onsite BOE Team will validate through interviews, visits to schools and review of other evidence that standards continue to be	<u>Site Visit Format</u> The Onsite BOE Team will validate through interviews, visits to schools and review of other evidence that standards continue to be	<u>Site Visit Format</u> The site visit takes the form of an academic audit in which the auditors seek to verify the evidence presented in the Inquiry Brief. Auditors examine	<u>Site Visit Format</u> The site visit takes the form of an academic audit in which the auditors seek to verify the program's own quality control processes and evidence of

Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative	Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement	Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief	Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report
met, follow-up on areas for concern raised in the Offsite BOE Report, and provide feedback on the Transformation Initiative. The Onsite BOE team writes the team report with recommendations about standards being met and citations of areas for improvement, if any.	met, follow-up on areas for concern raised in the Offsite BOE Report, and provide feedback on progress toward meeting one or more standards at the target level. The Onsite BOE team writes the team report with recommendations about standards being met and citations of areas for improvement, if any.	original data sources, reanalyze data presented by the program, and corroborate reported data through interviews and data collection. In addition, the Commission conducts independent on-line and on-site surveys of students, faculty and cooperating teachers.	student learning. In addition, auditors review the program’s plan for inquiry. The Commission conducts independent on-line and on-site surveys of students, faculty and cooperating teachers.
<u>Post-Site-Visit Process</u> The unit may submit a rejoinder to the BOE Report. The team chair may respond to the rejoinder. The Commission conducts an in-depth review of the BOE report, rejoinder, and the team chair’s response to the rejoinder; it also has access to the unit’s IR, Offsite BOE Report, and unit’s IR Addendum. The Commission determines whether each standard has been met at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. It recommends a final accreditation decision for each level to the CAEP Board		<u>Post-Site-Visit Process</u> Auditors prepare an Audit Report, which is first shared with the program, then sent to the TEAC Commission, which evaluates the self-study in light of the audit report and case analysis (prepared by TEAC staff). Program Representatives may be present when their case is considered by the Commission. The Commission’s recommendation regarding accreditation is forwarded to the CAEP Board.	
Determination of Accreditation Status Each of the Commissions’ accreditation recommendations are presented on a Consent Agenda to the CAEP Board, which reviews the process followed in each case and certifies that CAEP has followed its own procedures. The Board makes the final accreditation decisions. When an adverse decision is made by CAEP an institution may appeal the decision. The CAEP appeals process is common across all program options.			

Appendix B

AGREEMENT FOR CONDUCTING CALIFORNIA EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL and ACCREDITATION in conjunction with the TEACHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)
California Committee on Accreditation (COA)
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

As a means for ensuring that all institutions and other agencies in California offering professional educator preparation programs approved by the CTC at the undergraduate and/or graduate level(s) are meeting the California Common Standards and the appropriate program standards, pursuant to *Education Code 44372* and set forth in the *Accreditation Framework: Educator Preparation in California 2007*, programs must participate in the CTC's accreditation process. The purpose of the CTC's review is to assure the public and profession that educator preparation programs are adhering to standards established by the state, providing high quality preparation, and engaging in on-going program improvement.

The on-site visit for state accreditation will be conducted by the CTC and may be undertaken as a review in collaboration with TEAC. TEAC accreditation of the overall educator preparation program and accreditation of individual credential programs (called "program options" in the TEAC system) may be conducted at the same time. For those educator preparation programs that opt to seek TEAC accreditation, this agreement outlines the requirements of a concurrent review and audit leading to both California state accreditation and to TEAC national accreditation.

1. TEAC will serve as a partner in California's accreditation of the professional educator preparation programs for those California programs that elect to affiliate with TEAC. The CTC will serve as the contact and coordinating agent for the state.
2. TEAC accreditation will not substitute for CTC accreditation however the concurrent process will allow interested institutions to prepare for one set of accreditation activities that serve two distinct purposes: CTC and TEAC accreditation. This one set of activities will allow for institutional efficiencies in that one set of data collection, analysis, and program improvement activities will meet the requirements of two accrediting bodies.
3. TEAC will require that *Inquiry Briefs* or *Inquiry Brief Proposals* from California educator programs include evidence that adequately supports the program's claim that it meets the California Common Standards and the appropriate program standards.
 - The institutional claims must be research-based and responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks.
 - The institutional claims must provide direction for programs courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences.
 - Instructional personnel and relevant stakeholders must be actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all preparation programs.
 - The institution must have a process to monitor the credential recommendation process.

- The institutional claims must document that faculty and instructional personnel have current knowledge in the content they teach and of California's public schools.
 - The institution must show how it regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.
 - The institutional claims must address field experience as is defined in Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice and Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors.
4. The CTC will receive all documents associated with the TEAC audit, including the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, the *Audit Report*, the *Accreditation Panel Report* and the *Accreditation Committee Decision*.
 5. In addition to the California-TEAC Agreement, each California institution that elects to participate in concurrent CTC-TEAC accreditation activities must submit a brief proposal to the COA. The proposal must provide evidence to the COA that the Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal as designed by the institution will address both the CTC's Common Standards and the appropriate Program Standards. Institutions may use the Common Standards-TEAC alignment matrix as the basis for the institutional proposal. The approval from the COA should be sought a minimum of 24 months prior to a scheduled CTC-TEAC audit and an *Institution, TEAC and CTC Agreement* will be agreed to by all three parties.
 6. TEAC audits will incorporate information from the institution's educator preparation credential programs (program options); this includes, but is not limited, to teacher education, counselor education, administration and supervision, and other professional educator preparation programs. All educator preparation programs leading to initial or advanced professional credentials offered by that institution, but not selected for TEAC accreditation review, must seek approval from the CTC following state procedures. The accreditation of a credential program by TEAC does not substitute for state review.
 7. Institutions and agencies selecting TEAC accreditation will confirm the dates of each TEAC audit with the CTC before submitting dates to TEAC in order to facilitate scheduling of CTC staff for all accreditation audits. Continuing audits will be scheduled according to California's seven year accreditation cycle and TEAC's timetable for accreditation. CTC reserves the right to schedule a visit to a TEAC-accredited institution if it deems a visit necessary.
 8. Institutions and agencies selecting TEAC will pursue program accreditation according to TEAC'S accreditation categories, guidelines, and terms as defined in the California-TEAC Agreement. On occasion, after review of the institution's Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal, the COA may decide that the institution should complete one or more of the Commission's accreditation activities in addition to the TEAC activities.
 9. Institutions will prepare a single *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* in the format specified by TEAC and send a copy to TEAC and CTC. The documents will include evidence that TEAC's Quality Principles and Standards for Capacity have been met as well as provide evidence that California's Common Standards and the appropriate program standards have been met. The TEAC auditors will verify the evidence used to support the program's claims that it has met the appropriate state standards in addition to verifying other evidence that pertains to TEAC's quality principles and standards.
 10. Members from California's Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) will work with the TEAC auditors during the site visit, but will meet separately to make decisions related to all California

program and Common Standards. The members of the BIR will also make an accreditation recommendation as defined in the adopted Accreditation Framework.

11. TEAC auditors and representative(s) from California's BIR will be appointed according to their respective guidelines and will make up the concurrent audit/site visit team. A CTC representative shall serve as a point-of-contact to TEAC during the TEAC audit. Additional CTC representatives may be added to the TEAC audit teams as observers and/or consultants. The CTC representative may provide California contextual information during the audit process.

CTC representatives may attend the training workshops for TEAC auditors and/or the training of the institution or agency staff, with no training expense charged to CTC. CTC will be responsible for the travel expenses of its representative(s) for such training. The CTC will be responsible for ensuring that audit team representatives from California's BIR are adequately prepared to serve as audit team members. TEAC will provide feedback on the BIR audit team members' understanding and performance for each audit.

12. The audit report will be utilized by TEAC and follow the usual accreditation process at the conclusion of the visit. The report from the CTC site visit team will be presented to the COA at the scheduled meeting and follow the processes described in the Accreditation Handbook. The table below summarizes the activities in each accreditation system.

Sequence of Accreditation Activities	
Commission on Teacher Credentialing	Teacher Educator Accreditation Council
Institution prepares for the site visit	
Site visit is held (Sunday-Wednesday): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews and document review • Site visit team makes decisions on all program and Common Standards • Site visit team develops an accreditation recommendation • Site visit team writes the accreditation report 	Audit is held (Sunday-Wednesday): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews and document review • Audit team writes the Audit Report
Report is presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) COA reviews the report, hears from the institution and the team lead. COA makes the accreditation decision	Audit report is used to develop the Case Analysis
	Case Analysis is presented to the Accreditation Panel along with the Inquiry Brief hears the case and makes an accreditation recommendation
	Accreditation Committee reviews all materials and makes an accreditation decision
Institution may appeal based on the process	Institution will accept decision or appeal
Reports are submitted to the Commission over the next seven years as required by the accreditation system.	Annual reports are submitted to TEAC

13. The *Institution, TEAC and CTC Agreement* defines annual reports that will be submitted to TEAC and if additional information must be submitted to the Commission.
14. The institution shall cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the TEAC auditors according to TEAC guidelines. CTC will cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the BIR team members(s), CTC representative(s), and any state observer(s).
15. This partnership agreement shall be for an initial period of two years (February 1, 2010 through January 31, 2012) and may be modified by agreement of the two parties during that time, if deemed to be necessary. The intention of this agreement is to have an ongoing partnership with TEAC.
16. The terms of this agreement have been reached by mutual consent and have been read and understood by the persons whose signatures appear below. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the plan as set forth herein.

Frank B. Murray
President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council

Date

Dale Janssen
Executive Director, Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Date

Appendix C

NCATE/California Partnership Protocol for NCATE and State Reviews

Team Composition:
Joint

Program Review:
State - Based

Effective:
Jan. 2008 – Dec. 2014

Original Partnership Agreement Date: 1989

The NCATE/California Partnership Protocol delineates the processes and policies for granting accreditation to teacher education institutions and agreed upon by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and NCATE.

I. Standards II. Team III. Preparation IV. On-Site Review
V. After On-Site Review VI. On-Going Responsibilities

**** The NCATE website (www.ncate.org) contains information about all aspects of the accreditation process. Highlighted words marked with two asterisks (**), when inserted into the “NCATE Google search” will lead to the desired information.**

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<u>I. Standards</u>	
A. Unit Standards NCATE unit standards ** apply to the professional education unit. Specific state standards and institutional standards may also be applied to units and/or programs reviewed by NCATE.	A. Unit Standards: NCATE Standards The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Common Standards (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CommonStandardsTeacherPrep.pdf) apply to the unit seeking accreditation. Units have the option to utilize the NCATE unit standards in lieu of the California Common Standards, provided that areas not addressed in NCATE standards are addressed as a part of the NCATE Standards response. (See Attachment – NCATE/CTC Standards Comparison – 10/07)
B. State Program Standards NCATE defers to the state’s review of the unit’s programs. The teacher education	B. State Program Standards The Committee on Accreditation (COA) does not require units to submit NCATE program review

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>program standards or licensing standards and the state's review processes are sufficiently similar to NCATE's, as determined by the NCATE State Partnership Board (SPB).</p> <p>National Recognition: the unit may seek national recognition of a program by submitting program reviews** to NCATE.</p>	<p>documents. Units are required to submit documentation for the Program Assessment in the fourth year of the accreditation cycle for all approved programs.</p> <p>California Program Standards (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/STDS-prep-program.html) (or one of the approved Program Standards options described in Section 3 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>- http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf)</p>
II. Team	
<p>A. Team Composition: Joint State/ NCATE</p> <p>NCATE and state team members work together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities in all functions of the review.</p> <p>The NCATE team is selected from NCATE's Board of Examiners (BOE). The team includes representatives from organizations of teacher educators, teachers, education specialists and/or policy makers. Non-voting members of the team include the state consultant (usually the NCATE state partnership contact, or his/her designee), and a representative of the state affiliate of the National Education Association (NEA) and/or the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). Team assignments are systematically made to ensure that conflicts of interest are avoided.</p>	<p>A. Team Composition: Joint State/ NCATE</p> <p>The state team is selected by the CTC from the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR). The team includes faculty of higher education, teachers, and other school personnel.</p> <p>The site visit team will be the NCATE/COA Joint Common Standards Cluster. If the Program Assessment has identified any programs that will be reviewed during the site visit, additional team members will be assigned to focus on the identified program(s).</p> <p>Team assignments are systematically made to ensure that conflicts of interest are avoided.</p>
<p>B. Training Expectations: Joint</p> <p>NCATE team members must successfully complete the NCATE-sponsored BOE training**.</p>	<p>B. Training Expectations: Joint</p> <p>State team members will participate in an intensive four-day training program that focuses on team skills, interview techniques, accreditation procedures and the consistent application of standards. The Committee on Accreditation (COA) assures that the substance of the training is appropriate for new and returning team</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
	<p>members and cluster leaders. A special orientation to conducting joint visits will be provided to all team members at the first team meeting during the visit. In addition, the team is provided information on the structure and procedures of the joint visit in communications prior to arriving at the visit.</p>
<p>C. Team Size: Joint</p> <p>For first, continuing, and probation visits, the BOE team will include three to six members depending on several factors, including the number of candidates, faculty, and programs in the unit. Additional team members may be added to visit off-campus sites.</p> <p>For other visits, the team will include three BOE members, of which one will be a state team member.</p>	<p>C. Team Size: Joint</p> <p>For initial and continuing visits, a two to five-member state team is appointed by the CTC. The joint team, which is known in CA as the Common Standards Cluster, will consist of 3-6 BOE members and 1-2 state team members. The remaining state team members, if any, will be assigned to credential programs to review any credential programs identified by the Program Assessment that takes place two years prior to the site visit. (In the event of multi-site delivery systems or a particularly large number of programs, the state team size may be enhanced.)</p> <p>For probation or other visits, one to two state team members will be appointed to the team to review the unit standards. Additional state team members may be added to review programs, as appropriate.</p>
<p>D. Chair Responsibilities: Joint</p> <p>The NCATE chairperson and the state chairperson serve as co-chairs. They are jointly responsible for planning and conducting the visit.</p> <p>The co-chairs conduct a previsit approximately one to two months before the visit to plan interviews and finalize the logistics for the visit. The state consultant should participate in the previsit.</p> <p>The co-chairs assign team members to write to specific standards and to conduct specific interviews.</p>	<p>D. Chair Responsibilities: Joint</p> <p>In addition to the joint responsibilities described, the state chairperson is responsible for facilitating the work of the state program team members and coordinating the preparation of the State Team Report.</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>E. State Consultant</p> <p>NCATE invites the state education agency to appoint a state consultant to advise the team on state requirements, nomenclature, and special circumstances. The state consultant's expenses are covered by the respective agency. The state consultant facilitates an orientation to the state/NCATE Partnership at a team meeting prior to the review activities. The consultant is usually the state partnership contact, but may be his/her designee, and is a non-voting member of the BOE team. The state consultant may serve as a voting member of the state team, if so designated by the state.</p>	<p>E. State Consultant</p> <p>The administrator of accreditation (or designee) will collaborate with NCATE in establishing a schedule for each joint visit. The consultant will provide a planning visit approximately one year before the scheduled visit, review the Preliminary Report, review drafts of the Institutional Self-Study Report, and consult with the unit in planning for the visit and preparing the interview schedule. The consultant is responsible for providing a state team of appropriate size and configuration in consultation with the unit. The consultant is also responsible for assigning members of the team to serve as state co-chair and cluster leaders. The consultant provides support for the team during the three- or four-day visit, including team report development. The consultant also prepares the final team report for presentation to the COA.</p> <p>The state may assign additional staff consultants to assist the team during the visit. All expenses of these consultants are covered by the CTC.</p>
<p>F. NEA/AFT Representatives</p> <p>NCATE invites the state affiliates of the NEA and AFT to appoint observers for the on-site visit. The participants' respective agencies are responsible for their travel and maintenance expenses.</p> <p>These observers can assist the BOE team with the collection of data, interviews, and the editing of the team report. However, they should not be given a writing assignment. Observers are non-voting members of the BOE team.</p>	<p>F. NEA/AFT Representatives</p> <p>Individuals appointed by CTA or CFT to serve as observers may be K-12 educators or individuals from an institution of higher education. Each observer must understand the purposes of the joint NCATE-CTC accreditation site visit and the objective role of an observer. The individual must agree to abide by and sign the Commission's <i>Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality</i> agreement for accreditation visits as do all other site visit team members. If the observer is from an institution of higher education, the institution may not be from the same general geographic region or have any conflict of interest with the host institution. CTC retains the authority to determine whether the individual is from the same general geographic location or has a conflict of interest with the institution.</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>G. Decision-making</p> <p>Recommendations about whether the standards have been met, and the Areas for Improvement to be cited, are made jointly by national and state BOE members.</p> <p>Decisions are usually reached through consensus about whether standards are met. When consensus cannot be reached, a vote may be taken.</p>	<p>G. Decision-making</p> <p>The joint team (Common Standards Cluster) makes decisions about all state standards at the unit level and confirms the preliminary findings regarding programs that were developed through the Program Assessment Process. If necessary, a focused site visit may be scheduled to further investigate a specific program. The joint team makes a unit accreditation recommendation to the COA.</p>
<p>H. Writing the Report: Joint</p> <p>The co-chairs assign writing responsibilities to each BOE and State team member. The BOE report integrates the joint team's responses to the unit and state standards in a single report at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced levels as appropriate. If the state or institution has additional requirements, the report should have the BOE team's responses to the state/institution requirements attached as a report addendum. The final report is compiled by the BOE chair.</p> <p>The draft of the BOE report should be completed by the end of the on-site visit. Following the visit, the BOE team chair compiles and edits the report. It is then sent to NCATE and the team members for editing. After the chair incorporates these edits into the report, it is sent to the unit for correction of factual errors.</p> <p>The BOE team chair submits the final report to the NCATE office. Members of the NCATE team, members of the state team and the state consultant are notified that the report is available electronically. The editing process usually takes one to two months.</p>	<p>H. Writing the Report: Joint</p> <p>The Accreditation Handbook (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf) describes the requirements for the State Team Report. The NCATE/CTC Standards Comparison (10/07) will be used as the basis for the State Team Report.</p> <p>The Common Standards Cluster Report (written to the NCATE unit standards) is included as part of the total State Team Report to the COA. At the end of the visit, the state consultant must have a DRAFT of the written report including the NCATE Standard recommendations and the preliminary AFIs.</p> <p>Within two weeks of the visit, the state consultant and the California co-chair must receive an updated electronic copy of the <i>DRAFT</i> NCATE report.</p> <p>The State Team Report includes findings on all program standards and statements of strength and/or concern. These reports are included as part of the total team report to the COA. The COA will make its decision based upon the total team report and team accreditation recommendation.</p> <p>The COA team leader and the state consultant will be responsible for the preparation of the final report for the COA. The California report is public</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
	once it is posted on the COA's agenda.
<p>I. Evaluations</p> <p>Following the on-site visit, the performance of BOE members is evaluated electronically by the unit, the other national and state BOE members, and state consultants who served on the same visiting team. The evaluations are used by NCATE and the state to determine who should continue BOE service and to identify potential team chairs.</p>	<p>I. Evaluations</p> <p>The state team is evaluated by the California co-chair, the state consultant and the institution. The evaluations are used by CTC to determine who should continue to serve on site visit teams and to identify potential team chairs.</p>
<p>J. Expenses</p> <p>During the semester of the visit, the unit will pay NCATE a Periodic Evaluation Fee** per NCATE BOE team member participating in the on-site visit. In addition, the institution is responsible for the local expenses of the BOE team members. Refer to a Periodic Evaluation Fee**</p>	<p>J. Expenses</p> <p>The expenses for the COA team members will be paid by the Commission. The Commission will also pay the expenses for the state consultant staff and any COA/Commission observers.</p>
<p>III. Preparation</p>	
<p>A. Unit's Intent-to-Seek** Request</p> <p>For first-time accreditation, the unit should indicate its interest in seeking accreditation at least two years before hosting an on-site visit by submitting an "Intent to Seek Accreditation**" form on NCATE's website.. The request should include the semester and year in which the unit plans to host the on-site review which must be at least one year after program reports are submitted to NCATE.</p> <p>For continuing accreditation the institution should complete the "Intent to Continue Accreditation**" form, found on the NCATE website two years before the visit.</p>	<p>A. Unit's Intent-to-Seek** Request</p> <p>For first-time joint NCATE-CTC accreditation, the unit seeking the joint accreditation should contact the Administrator of Accreditation at least two years before the intended site visit.</p> <p>For continuing accreditation, the institution should confirm the dates for the site visit a minimum of one year prior to the site visit.</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>B. Preconditions</p> <p>For first visits, the unit must show evidence that it meets NCATE's preconditions^{**}. The preconditions report must be submitted to the NCATE office at least eighteen months prior to the on-site visit by February 1 or September 15.</p> <p>All accredited units <i>must continue to meet the preconditions</i> for continued NCATE accreditation. Annually, NCATE reviews Title II test data and will request additional information from a unit that no longer meets the required state pass rate^{**} or other preconditions.</p>	<p>B. Preconditions</p> <p>The unit prepares a Precondition Report one year before the visit, responding to all CTC preconditions and providing other information described in the <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i> (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf). The preconditions are outlined in the appropriate standards documents as <i>Preconditions for the Approval of Professional Preparation Programs</i>.</p> <p>The Precondition Report is reviewed and filed by CTC.</p>
<p>C. Program Reports</p> <p>If the unit voluntarily chooses to submit program reports to NCATE, it must submit them by March 15 or September 15, at least two semesters before the continuing visit.</p>	<p>C. Program Reports</p> <p>The state's program review is completed two years prior to the scheduled site visit. Preliminary program findings are presented to the COA and the institution a minimum of one year prior to the site visit. The preliminary findings identify if additional team members will be assigned to the site visit team to address any questions or concerns that still exist.</p>
<p>D. Institutional Report</p> <p>The professional education unit must write and submit an Institutional Report^{**} (IR) which describes the unit's conceptual framework and the evidence demonstrating that the unit standards are met. In continuing accreditation visits, the IR also serves as the primary documentation of the unit's growth and development since the last accreditation visit.</p> <p>The IR is written online and all team members have online access.</p>	<p>D. Institutional Report</p> <p>The unit prepares a Self-Study Report in response to the NCATE unit standards, as described in the <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i> (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf). And the CCTC/NCATE Standards. Comparison – 10/07 (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-files/CTC-NCATE-Crosswalk.doc).</p> <p>The report also provides a response to the CTC Program Standards or one of the approved options for each credential area. The unit sends one copy of the Institutional Report to each team member (BOE and state) and two copies to the CTC. At its option, the unit may sub-divide the report and send responses to program standards</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
	to specifically assigned state team members.
<p>E. Dates of On-Site Visit</p> <p>NCATE requests the unit to submit its preferred visit date to NCATE at least one year prior to the on-site visit. <u>The date must be approved by the state agency prior to submitting its request to NCATE.</u></p> <p>First, continuing and probation visits are scheduled from Saturday through Wednesday except in special circumstances.</p> <p>The state agency must consult with NCATE regarding any delays requested by institutions.</p>	<p>E. Dates of On-Site Visit</p> <p>The specific dates of joint COA/NCATE visits are negotiated between the CTC, NCATE and the unit. The unit notifies NCATE of the agreed-upon dates at least one (1) year ahead of the visit.</p>
<p>F. Previsit</p> <p>The previsit should be scheduled about one to two months before the on-site visit. See the <i>NCATE Handbook** for Accreditation Visits</i> for further details.</p> <p>The state consultant, BOE co-chairs, head of the unit, and NCATE coordinator should participate in the previsit.</p> <p>The institutional report will be available to the participants electronically in AIMS prior to the previsit.</p>	<p>F. Previsit</p> <p>A state consultant is assigned approximately 2 years before the visit to assist the unit in preparing for the visit.</p> <p>A planning visit is scheduled at least one year in advance by the state consultant. Final dates are set and the visit schedule is discussed. Standards to be used, as well as team make up and configuration are clarified.</p> <p>A previsit is scheduled within 60-days of the visit by the NCATE co-chair, the COA co-chair, and the state consultant. Plans are finalized for the accreditation visit.</p> <p>At the previsit, the state consultant will provide a specialized orientation to the merged site visit process.</p>
<p>G. 3Rd Party Testimony</p> <p>Six months before the on-site review, the unit must publish a “Call for Comment” inviting 3rd party testimony related to the upcoming</p>	<p>G. 3Rd Party Testimony</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>NCATE visit. Comments should be sent directly to NCATE.</p> <p>One to two months before the on-site review, NCATE sends copies of third-party testimony to the unit for comment.</p>	
IV. On-Site Review	
<p>A. Orientation to State Process/ Protocol</p> <p>The state consultant (or his/her designee) will facilitate an orientation to the state process and protocol at one of the team meetings early in the visit.</p>	<p>A. Orientation to State Process/ Protocol</p>
<p>B. Conducting the On-Site Review</p> <p>The national BOE and state team members work together as a single team throughout the visit. State team members have the same responsibilities as national members including writing the BOE report.</p> <p>The template for an on-site visit** can be found on the NCATE website and in the <i>NCATE Handbook** for Accreditation visits</i>.</p>	<p>B. Conducting the On-Site Review</p> <p>All regular site visits are scheduled to begin on Saturday afternoon for the Common Standards Cluster (BOE members and state team members) and visit co-chairs. The remainder of the team will join the visit on Sunday afternoon. The accreditation visit is to be completed by Wednesday afternoon.</p> <p>The visit schedule will include opportunities for the BOE/COA team to have total team meetings. The interview schedule will provide an opportunity for all team members to obtain interview data from the appropriate sources. If specified program team members are scheduled for the visit, the members will primarily conduct interviews related to the program areas. The unit will prepare exhibits and files for use by the team.</p> <p>The <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i> (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf) contains the procedures to be followed in an accreditation visit.</p>
<p>C. Evidence/Exhibit Room</p> <p>Electronic exhibit rooms are encouraged.</p>	<p>C. Evidence/Exhibit Room</p> <p>The <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i></p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
See NCATE's electronic exhibit room guidelines** .	(http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf) provides information about the document/exhibit room.
<p>D. BOE Report</p> <p>The BOE report includes the BOE team's responses to the unit and state standards at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced levels as appropriate. It indicates the level (unacceptable, acceptable or target) at which each element of the standards is met. If the state/Institution has additional requirements, the report should have the BOE team's responses to the state requirements attached as a state addendum. The final report is compiled by the BOE chair.</p> <p>After the report has been edited the BOE team chair submits one copy of the final BOE report to the NCATE office. NCATE BOE team members, state team members and the state consultant are notified that the report is available electronically.</p>	<p>D. BOE Report</p> <p>The state team chair, the NCATE chair, team members, and the state consultant will meet with administrators and faculty members of the institution and will present a written copy of the draft report, including findings on standards and an accreditation status recommendation in an open meeting at the end of the visit.</p> <p>At the end of the final meeting with the unit, the accreditation team report is finalized by the team co-chairs and the state consultant. The final accreditation report, with recommendations, is placed on the COA agenda within 60-working days of the visit.</p>
<p>E. Exit Report</p> <p>An exit report is conducted before the team departs on Wednesday. It is conducted by the co chairs and state consultant. The unit is represented by the unit head and coordinator of the NCATE review; the president and/or provost may also attend.</p>	<p>E. Exit Report</p> <p>At the end of the site visit, the state team conducts a meeting with the dean and invited faculty and/or staff and presents a report including its findings and the accreditation recommendation for the unit. At this time, the Common Standards/NCATE portion of the report will contain the recommended findings on all NCATE standards and preliminary AFIs in addition to the program reports.</p>
<p>V. After the On-Site Review</p>	
<p>A. BOE report sent from NCATE</p> <p>NCATE notifies the CEO of the institution, the unit head, and the appropriate state agency or agencies that the BOE report is</p>	<p>A. BOE report sent from NCATE</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
available electronically.	
<p>B. Rejoinder</p> <p>The unit submits to NCATE and the state an electronic copy of its institutional rejoinder** to the BOE report within 30 days after receipt of the BOE Report.</p>	<p>B. Rejoinder</p> <p>On the next-to-last day of the visit, a mid-visit status report is held with the team co-chairs, institutional leadership and state consultant. At that time, the team indicates, in writing, any areas in which additional information is needed for areas in which the standards may be in question. The unit has until the end of that day to provide additional information to the team. No other rejoinder is available.</p>
<p>C. Accreditation</p> <p>NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) determines the accreditation status of professional education units, during meetings twice a year in April and October. Accreditation decisions are rendered at the UAB meeting in the semester that follows the BOE review. A description of the Unit Accreditation Board** can be found on the NCATE website.</p> <p>Final decisions about national recognition of programs are posted on NCATE's website after the UAB has determined accreditation.</p> <p>NCATE provides written notice of all accreditation decisions to the U.S. Department of Education, the appropriate state licensing or authorizing agency, all accrediting agencies recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), and the public (via the NCATE website).</p> <p>More information about reporting accreditation decisions may be found in NCATE's Policies on Dissemination of Information**. Definitions of NCATE accreditation decisions** can also be found</p>	<p>C. Program Approval</p> <p>The COA will determine the accreditation status at the COA meeting within sixty working days of the site visit. Such action will be taken independent of later anticipated action of the NCATE/UAB decision. A copy of the above action will be provided to NCATE.</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
on NCATE's website.	
<p>D. Final Action Report</p> <p>Within 30 days after NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board takes action on the accreditation of the unit, NCATE sends the chief executive officer and head of the professional education unit a letter that indicates the official action.</p>	<p>D. Final Action Report</p> <p>The unit is to be informed of COA action regarding its accreditation status within 10-working days following such action.</p>
<p>E. Appeal Procedure</p> <p>Units may appeal any accreditation decisions by the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board. See NCATE's website for specific policies and procedures related to the appeals process**.</p>	<p>E. Appeal Procedure</p> <p>Within 20-days after the visit, the unit may submit evidence to the COA that the team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or contrary to the policies of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf or procedural guidelines of the COA.</p> <p>The COA may make a different decision than that recommended by the team. If this should happen, the team chair may file a dissent with the Commission. The COA may assign a new team to visit the unit. The new team may recommend the same or different accreditation status.</p> <p>A unit has the right to appeal the COA decision to accredit with stipulations or deny accreditation to the Commission if the COA decisions appear to be arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to the policies of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf.</p>
<p>VI. On-Going Responsibilities</p>	
<p>A. Protocol Distribution</p> <p>NCATE will post the NCATE/California Partnership Protocol** on its website; it is also available in hard copy upon request.</p>	<p>A. Protocol Distribution</p> <p>The CTC will distribute the Protocol to all units following the creation/renewal of a Partnership or after either party makes revisions.</p>
<p>B. Accreditation Cycle</p> <p>Units that receive accreditation will be</p>	<p>B. Accreditation Cycle</p> <p>Units in the State of California will move to a</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>scheduled for their next visit seven years from the semester in which their visit occurred. The seven-year cycle of visits applies only if the state has agreed to a seven-year cycle for all continuing visits.</p> <p>Units may be requested to host a visit within two years following accreditation. The state will participate in these visits at its discretion.</p>	<p>seven-year cycle after the first continuing accreditation review.</p> <p>State visits will be scheduled to coincide with NCATE visits.</p>
<p>C. Code of Conduct</p> <p>To assure units and the public that NCATE reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the accreditation system, BOE members, board members, program reviewers, and staff shall follow NCATE's Code of Conduct**.</p> <p>Violation of any part of the Code of Conduct could result in the board member's removal from the board.</p>	<p>C. Code of Conduct</p> <p>State team members are expected to follow the Conflict of Interest, Professional Behavior and Ethical Guidelines contained in the <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i> http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf</p>
<p>D. Annual Reviews</p>	<p>D. Annual Reviews</p>
<p>1. Regional Accreditation</p> <p>Units must maintain regional accreditation or institutional accreditation by a USDE or CHEA recognized agency in order to continue their NCATE accreditation.</p>	<p>1. Regional Accreditation</p> <p>All units and/or program sponsors must be regionally accredited.</p>
<p>2. Change in State Status</p> <p>Notification of an NCATE accredited unit's "Change in State Status" by the state will initiate a review by NCATE's <i>Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee (ARPA)</i>.</p> <p>The NCATE president will notify the unit that the state has informed NCATE of a change</p>	<p>2. Change in State Status</p> <p>The California policies that apply to a "Change in State Status" are described in the <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i>, http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf.</p> <p>California will notify NCATE of the accreditation</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
<p>in their state status and require the unit to submit a special report within 90 days.</p>	<p>decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation for each NCATE accredited unit or NCATE accreditation candidate.</p> <p>California will send a copy of the Accreditation Team Report and appropriate back-up material for each merged visit. Units receiving “Accreditation with Stipulations” or “Withdrawal of Accreditation” will be identified.</p> <p>All California accreditation decisions are published in the Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation.</p> <p>Each unit receiving “Accreditation with Stipulations” will have an amount of time specified by the Committee on Accreditation action to remove the stipulations – either through written documentation, a focused re-visit or both.</p> <p>The conditions under which stipulations are designated and the process for their removal are described in the <i>CTC Accreditation Handbook</i>, http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf.</p>
<p>3. Precondition 7</p> <p>The unit’s programs are approved by the appropriate state agency and, in states with educator licensing examinations and required pass rates, the unit’s summary pass rate must continue to meet or exceed the required state pass rate to maintain national recognition.</p>	<p>3. Precondition 7</p>
<p>4. Annual Report</p> <p>Submission of the Annual Report** is a requirement for all units that are accredited by NCATE. Annual Reports are due October 1st and must be submitted electronically.</p> <p>Substantive changes to the unit and its programs must be reported annually in Part C of the Annual Report. Substantive changes, such as offering distance learning</p>	<p>4. Annual Report</p> <p>All institutions/program sponsors that prepare educators in California are required to submit Biennial Reports. The Biennial Reports address issues of candidate competence as defined in the appropriate adopted program standards.</p>

NCATE Policy	State Policy
programs, may require a follow-up report or interim visit.	